



ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT AND SEAWALL REPLACEMENT PROJECT COMMENT SUMMARY

November 2003

Introduction

The Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project database contains 3,545 comments, 68 of which were submitted in November 2003.

Origin of Comments

63 of the comments received came from attendees at community briefings held by the project team. Four comments were submitted on the website and one comment was submitted through email.

26 comments were received from the southern area of the project, 23 from the central area, and 17 from the northern area. Two comments came from outside the project area.

Comments received at the community briefings are given during presentations by the project team. Comments and questions are recorded by a project team member and logged into the comment database.

Comment Categories

Each comment submitted is categorized by the content of the message. There are 60 comment categories divided into six sections. The sections are economic, structures/locations, involved parties, transportation, design and construction, and environmental. The comment categories range from cost and freight to traffic, air pollution and public safety.

Comments were received in the areas listed below. These are groups of similar categories with the ideas that were expressed in the comments.

Design/Construction:

This group includes categories such as construction, urban design, the seawall, and parks/green space. There were 54 comments in this group.

- Would there be improvements to other arterials in the Surface Alternative?
- What is the projected design life of each alternative?
- What are potential impacts or changes of the Aerial interchange option in the south?
- What is the location of the tunnel portal in the south?
- How can construction time be reduced?
- Are the grades of the aerial structure to Battery St. Tunnel acceptable to FHWA?



Traffic:

This group includes categories such as traffic, connections/circulations, pedestrians, and bicycles. There were 29 comments in this group.

- How is traffic growth being addressed in each alternative?
- What would be done to accommodate the increase in traffic on other arterials in the Surface Alternative?
- Do the travel times take into account traffic from the ferries and other waterfront destinations?
- At what point in time was the travel time model taken?
- None of the alternatives seem to account for growth in traffic capacity on the viaduct.

Economic:

The group includes categories such as cost, funding, property value/acquisition, and tolls. There were eight comments in this group.

- What funding has already been generated?
- How is cost factoring into the decision?
- What are the funding sources being considered and are all sources being considered?

Transit:

This group includes categories like light rail, monorail, and transit. There were four comments in this group.

- Is the viaduct project being incorporated into other transportation projects in the region?
- Will construction of the monorail impact the viaduct's construction?